R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 725 EA 001 294

STATEWIDE SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION STUDIES--A SUMMARY.

BY- GOVE, SAMUEL K.
EDUCATIONAL COMMISSION OF THE STATES

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.96 22P.

DESCRIPTORS- *HIGHER EDUCATION, *SCHOOL SYSTEMS, *SURVEYS, *EDUCATIONAL COORDINATION, *EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, STATE GOVERNMENT, STATE FEDERAL AID, INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, STATE COLLEGES, ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE, METHODOLOGY, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, MASTER PLANS, DECISION MAKING, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, *STATE AGENCIES, STATE UNIVERSITIES, CINCINNATI,

THIS SURVEY BRIEFLY DESCRIBES RESEARCH IN PROGRESS OR JUST COMPLETED ON COORDINATION AND PLANNING OF HIGHER EDUCATION. FOUR GENERAL AND THREE RELATED STUDIES CURRENTLY UNDERWAY AND SIX STATE STUDIES, ALL BUT ONE OF WHICH ARE COMPLETED, ARE DESCRIBED. THE PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO PINPOINT SPECIFIC MATERIAL POTENTIALLY USEFUL TO EDUCATIONAL AND POLITICAL DECISIONMAKERS WHILE FURTHERING THE POSSIBILITY OF INFORMATION EXCHANGE AMONG RESEARCHERS ENGAGED IN THIS TOPIC. (TT)

ED019725

PREFACE

Higher education constitutes one of the fastest-growing and most costly of state-supported programs. The growth, the cost, and the importance of colleges and universities have all been compelling factors in the increasing demand for coordination of the long-range planning and development of these institutions.

Although the concept of individual institutional autonomy continues to be valued, state-wide systems of public higher education are developing in many of the states, and different methods of coordinating these systems are emerging. Because of the varied ways the several states have approached these problems, questions continually are raised about the relative values of different kinds of coordinating bodies and mechanisms for higher education.

A number of studies designed to answer some of these questions are now in process across the country. The Education Commission of the States has undertaken to provide for its membership and other interested readers an analysis and summary of the major studies underway, so that educational and political decision makers at the state level will know where to look for the specific data which may be of interest to them.

The report which follows, carefully prepared and clearly presented by Dr. Samuel K. Gove, Director, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, is furnished as an informational service by the ECS.

--Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

EA 001 294

STATEWIDE SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION STUDIES: A SUMMARY

Samuel K. Gove
Director, Institute of Government and Public Affairs
University of Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Many studies of statewide systems of higher education are in progress at the present time, probably more than ever before. The coverage of the current studies vary considerably although much attention is given to the joint problems of coordination and planning.

One commentator in a national publication suggested that there were too many studies and somewhat facetiously asked "who is coordinating the coordinators?" Actually, there has been considerable exchange of information among the various study directors, and in some studies that cover several states, researchers exchange interview information. This paper is designed to further the cause of information exchange.[1]

But are there too many studies? Most decidedly "no." We know far too little about the implications of coordination and planning of higher education on a statewide basis now, let alone on a national basis. In most cases now, coordinating agencies are created in a state after some extreme example of "duplication" is found which brings the legislature to action. When this situation arises the higher education institutions frequently react negatively without taking an objective look at the situation. If more light is shed on the realities of the

---

[1] In addition to the studies reported here which are primarily concerned with coordination and planning, there is a study by the 15-member Carnegie Commission, headed by Clark Kerr. One of the first tasks of this four year broad based study is to prepare a listing of "all current research now being done across the nation in higher education."

situation, and more importantly the educational implications of various courses of action, then state governments might make decisions on a more rational basis, and the decisions might be ones that all parties can live with.

Also in support of the current research, and of encouraging more such studies, research persons in higher education should be encouraged to take an occasional look at their own "world." Some of the current studies are putting state systems of higher education in proper political perspective. This may help shed some light on this virtually unexplored facet of higher education. Concern for more information in this area is not new. But still the definitive work on this subject has yet to be published. Hopefully some of the present studies will be steps toward filling this void.

The many current studies have greatly different subject concerns. Probably the most comprehensive is the Study of Statewide Systems of Higher Education for the American Council on Education. Other studies are looking in depth at higher education master plans, while others are concentrating on the effect of federal aid programs on systems of higher education. Still others have a more limited area of concern: some are limited to analysis of coordination in a single state.

The following is a brief description of the various studies highlighting their major areas of concern.[2] Each study is being conducted with its own timetable. In only a few instances have there been any published results. Although methodological approaches vary,

---

[2]Most of the information that follows was taken from project proposals.

generally the studies rely on interviews, questionnaires, and a review of existing documents.

American Council on Education

The Council's project is called a Study of Statewide Systems of Higher Education and is being conducted under the auspices of the Council's Commission on Plans and Objectives. Through in-depth research in selected states representing a variety of higher education coordinating mechanisms, the study plans to analyze the evolution of coordination and of the agencies performing this function and to investigate the effects of coordination upon individual institutions. Also the effect of coordination on relations of higher education with state government will be analyzed.[3]

By the use of relevant state documents and confidential interviews with knowledgeable people, criteria for evaluating "effective" coordination will be developed. The study staff is also exploring such issues as essential attributes of institutional autonomy, higher education's responsibility to the public interest, the degree and form of coordination necessary to maintain them, the influence of coordination on the nature and quality of educational decision-making, the relationship of state government to private higher education, and the relationship of coordination to master planning.

The staff considers the most important, and most complex, part of the study to be a sophisticated analysis of the multiple interrela-

---

[3]The states included in this study are Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

tionships among and between some eight to ten different constituencies, which can be divided into three major groups; higher education, state government and politics, and the coordinating board.

The first grouping, higher education, includes all the sub-divisions of public universities, state colleges, branch campuses and/or community colleges, and the private sector, both sectarian and non-sectarian.

The second group, that of state government and politics, centers normally on the office of governor, his department of finance, and the legislature and affiliated agencies such as legislative budget officers. Of interest here is also the state board of education. Behind these governmental figures stand the public at large and various pressure groups, both those specifically concerned with education, and others, such as taxpayers associations, which have views relevant to educational issues. Mass media are included in this category since the media both influence and reflect the attitudes of the public on higher education.

The third group is that of the coordinating or governing board with its three main sub-units: executive director, staff, and membership.

In the states included in the Council's study, persons have been interviewed in each of the three groups to learn more about the following: the allocation of role and scope functions within the public sector, including in particular the approval of new graduate programs; the allocation of funds within public higher education; establishment of branch campuses versus the development of new campuses; location of new campuses; the role of the coordinating agency as an

intermediary between higher education and state government; the ways in which the coordinating agency receives and interprets political definitions of the public interest in higher education; the ways the agency receives and interprets educational opinion about essential attributes of autonomy; the nature and adequacy of the agency's legal charge, operating staff, executive leadership and lay membership; the distribution of powers between the coordinating agency and the state government on the one hand, and the institutions of higher education on the other (including in particular the nature of budgetary review exercised by the coordinating agency over the budget requests of the public sector, and the nature of program approval and disapproval); and lastly the role of the coordinating agency in on-going master planning.

The staff for the study is headed by Robert O. Berdahl, political scientist from San Francisco State College. Several additional researchers have been engaged to handle the interviewing in one or more states. The staff has also made a concerted effort to act as a communications center to provide for the exchange of information concerning the various studies described in this paper.

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education

This center, located at the University of California, Berkeley, is involved in a study of "Statewide Planning in Higher Education: A Study of Planned Organizational Change."

As suggested by the title of the study, the emphasis is on planning. As set out in the study description, a basic and very important question is:

What are the consequences of statewide planning for individual

> institutions, and how do these consequences vary by the type of institution (general university, four-year college, two-year college)? Also, what appears to be the relationship between the nature and process of planning on the one hand and the consequences for individual institutions on the other?[4]

Some of the questions that will be researched in regard to institutional consequences are:

1. Changes in institutional authority and autonomy - Is statewide planning having the effect of moving the authority to make decisions out of local campuses to higher administrative levels? Are certain types of institutions affected to a greater degree than others? If decisions are drifting up, are they "critical?" To what extent and in what way is the movement of decisions in the administrative hierarchy arousing feelings among trustees and administrators of loss or gain of institutional autonomy, and loss or gain of academic freedom among faculty? How will the drift affect the level and type of conflict between "professional authority" on the one hand, and "bureaucratic" or "administrative" on the other?

2. Changes in institutional function and character - Has the primary mission of some institutions been altered? If so, in what way, to what extent, and with what effects? How is the transition in primary institutional mission been accomplished and in what ways have the trustees, administration, and faculty supported or resisted this change?

---

[4]As the study proposal said "Care must be exercised by using 'consequences' in an absolute cause-and-effect sense. The intent is to examine the relationships between statewide planning and changes within institutions, and hopefully, to be able to identify the perceived link between the two. Multiple sources of data should help to delineate if particular changes are related to statewide planning, and if these relationships have any causal implications."

In what way is the character (i.e., curricular patterns, faculty values, the distribution of authority, public images, student traditions) of institutions being transformed or modified? Are the changes in character promoted from within or imposed by outside forces? If the emphasis of institutional character is changing, how much concern is there among administrators, faculty, and students about these changes in emphasis? What now appears to be the distinctive institutional character emerging on different campuses?

3. Redefinition of roles and positions of trustees, administration, faculty, students - Are new administrative positions being created to undertake, facilitate, and accommodate to the new and changing requirements of statewide and institutional planning? Are the number and variety of expectations for various position occupants (e.g., trustee, president, other administrators, faculty) increasing and becoming more complex? Are inconsistencies and conflicts between and within roles increasing, decreasing, or changing in form? To what extent are the existing relationships between positions being changed? Are the bases of influence and authority of the chief campus administrator over other administrators, faculty, and students changing and, if so, in what ways?

4. Modifications to system linkages and inter-organizational relationships - Are organizational rivalries for funds, programs, students, facilities, and faculty increasing, decreasing, or changing in form? Are there new or expanded ways in which institutions cooperate on a formal basis, i.e., exchanges of students and faculty, joint programs, degrees, course-offerings, etc.?

5. Statewide and institutional planning - a problem of articu-

lation - What role does institutional planning have in statewide planning? Is institutional planning more likely to precede or follow statewide planning? Has statewide planning stimulated basic issues on local campuses such as what should be the distinctive contribution of the institution to the statewide system of higher education? How are the various interests of the campus to be preserved and its distinctive identity to be fostered within the statewide plan?

With these questions in mind, master planning in three groups of states chosen primarily on "planning age" will be analyzed. In the first group will be states that have had a short history in statewide planning and are now in the process of developing their first statewide plan. In these states, emphasis would be on a careful examination of the development or the plan and the first wave of effects or consequences of statewide planning for institutions.

A second set of states would be chosen to include some in which a statewide plan has been completed or will be completed soon. The research in these states will focus on the processes to implement the plan and especially the points at which the plan is modified, as a result of legislative action or institutional bargaining. This phase would also allow for an examination of changes in institutions when a statewide plan is being implemented. Predictions in these states would be made about future developments and institutional consequences.

A third group of states would be selected to include some in which statewide planning has a longer history. Primary attention in these states would be given to the consequences of statewide planning for individual institutions. A second interest in these states is on

the history of planning activities and specific steps that lead to the existing statewide plan.[5]

Considerations in the selection of the states were: 1) size and comprehensiveness of the state higher educational system, 2) existence of a statewide plan, 3) perception that certain other reports or documents serve as a statewide plan, 4) age of the coordinating mechanism, 5) history of work on statewide problems and issues in higher education, 6) type of coordinating mechanism, 7) accessibility of the state for intensive study, 8) sophistication employed in statewide planning and coordination, 9) geographical distribution, 10) extent that a state represents a "pure type" for each of the statewide planning phases.

The staff for this study of planning is headed by Ernest G. Palola, project director.

Academy for Educational Development, Inc.

The Academy is also looking at planning in its Study of the Outlook and Planning for Higher Education to 1980. The study is supported by funds from the National Institute of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Office of Education. The purpose is to gather information that will be helpful to relevant federal agencies in developing their own plans to serve better American higher education. Unlike the earlier studies mentioned, this one would involve all 50 states.

At the outset, the study would include an examination, description and critique of the status of: 1) planning for higher education within

---

[5]The states included in this study were: first group--Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Virginia; second group--Illinois, Ohio, Oklahoma and Texas; third group--California, Florida, New York.

the 50 states, 2) state master plans for higher education, and 3) regional planning for higher education. In an attempt to describe the present situation in each state, information will be sought to identify the planning agencies, groups or institutions within a state, with particular concern to find out if there is one agency responsible for overall planning. Other general information questions are these: What new higher education institutions will begin operation during the calendar years 1966 and 1967? What regional associations or groupings have responsibilities for higher education planning? What interrelationships exist between the planning agencies and other groups such as foundations and educational associations?

In each state master plans which exist will be reviewed in detail to learn of the extent of the authority of the state plan or plans. Questions to be asked are these: Is the plan a basis for action or does it only provide general guidelines? Is there any relation between state plans and the plans of institutions or regional bodies? What are the objectives, assumtpions and priorities on which the plan is based? Is it planned to provide public higher education for all eligible students or to rely on the expansion of private higher education? What allowances are made for the in-migration or out-migration of students?

This is a brief review of the types of questions that are to be asked in the survey. Most of the information will be obtained from a detailed questionnaire rather than comprehensive field interviews, as is the case of the two studies summarized above. The product of the study will be comprehensive and factual rather than analytical.

The study director for the Academy project is Professor Lewis B. Mayhew of Stanford University.

U.S. Office of Education

The Bureau of Higher Education of the Office of Education has a study underway entitled "State Comprehensive Planning for Higher Education - Current Practices."

The main focus of this study is on identifying the best methodologies and procedures available for comprehensive planning for higher education at the state level. A secondary aim is a systematic outlining of the topic areas which make up master planning.

Most of the procedures used in the study have been drawn from current state plans and supporting documents. In some topic areas the methodology of current practices has been found to be deficient and new findings have been introduced. In the case of student financial aid, an entirely new model is presented. By and large, however, the bulk of the material represents tested practices. According to the authors, in one sense, the study can be considered an introductory "workbook" for state comprehensive planning to be supplemented by many recommended references.

The final document from the study will include a brief series of general statements by planners stressing the importance to the planners of the social environment in which higher education operates, e.g., the social values attached to college attendance, the historical place of higher education in the state, the economic base of the state, and the factors of state resource allocation through the legislative process. Also to be included is an outline of the elements needed to carry out a competent study regardless of the planning structure: basic staff requirements; communication links to be established; liaison needed with

other institutions and agencies; staff papers and reports which seem desirable; final report forms, including recommendations and means for evaluation of progress in fulfilling the plan.

The eight parts of the study organization give an indication of the direction the study takes. These are: higher education planning - an introduction; the state socio-economic environment; establishment of the role and scope of institutions; extending educational opportunities; meeting the state's educational program needs; establishment of excellence in selected areas; state financing and resource allocation; and facility planning.

The principal investigators for the project are D. Kent Halstead and Robert E. Jennings of the Planning, Evaluation and Reports Staff, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RELATED STUDIES

In addition to these studies concerned with the overall view of planning and coordination, there are a number of studies underway on related topics.

Southern Regional Education Board

The SREB has a study that relates to one aspect of the broader subject, namely, the Impact of Federal Programs in Higher Education on State Planning and Coordination. The primary purpose of the study is to measure the extent and discern the nature of the impact of federal programs on both the planning and coordinating functions and the state

coordinating agencies and boards in selected states.[6] For the consideration of those developing new and administering existing federal programs, attention will be given to the academic and political implications of "state-oriented" programs as differentiated from "institution-oriented" programs.

The state-oriented programs that will be given emphasis are those in the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the State Technical Services Act, and the Higher Education Act of 1965. But the investigation will include a study of the effects of other federal programs including the Housing Act of 1950, the National Defense Education Act, portions of the Public Health Services Act, the Veteran's Educational Assistance Act, the Library Services and Construction Act, and others.

The study proposal lists many questions to be asked to help in determining the impact. Some of these are: To what extent are state planning and coordinating boards or commissions for higher education involved in administering state-oriented federal higher education programs? To what extent have other state agencies been designated as the state agency for administering state-oriented federal higher education programs and what reasons or circumstances led to the dispersion of responsibility? Has administration of federal programs created any problems in the organization, management, or operation of state boards or commissions? To what extent have the new state-oriented federal

---

[6]The states selected for this study are both in and outside of the jurisdiction of the SREB. They are: Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas within the Southern Region; and California, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Oregon from outside the South.

programs resulted in changes in organization, purpose, or function of state boards or commissions? Has the administration of state-oriented federal programs affected the status of the state boards or commissions in the structure of state government? Have state-oriented federal programs stimulated consideration of, or developments of, new state higher education boards or commissions in states previously without them?

How has the administration of federal aid to education programs by state boards or commissions affected the status of these boards with the higher education community in the state? What is the reaction of the public institutions to this new role of the state boards or commissions? What is the reaction of the non-public sector of higher education to the new role of the state board or commission? Have the board-administered federal programs affected the relationship between the public and private sectors of higher education in the states? What impact have the state-oriented federal programs had on state master planning? To what extent will, or has, the state board or commission utilized federal funds available for planning activities?

What impact have the state-oriented federal programs had on the coordinating activities of the state boards or commissions? Have any of the state-oriented federal programs impeded state efforts to plan and coordinate state higher education? Have any of the institution-oriented federal programs impeded efforts at state planning and coordination? If so, which programs have had this effect, and to what extent? To what extent is state planning involved in or coordinated with federal data collection activities?

The information needed to answer these questions will be solicited by questionnaires which will attempt to assess for each state the

impact of the various federal acts and programs. To provide the depth of inquiry essential to a meaningful analysis, to examine more closely asserted cause and effect relationships, and to analyze reported effects of federal actions in relation to the type and extent of a state's coordinating efforts, personal interviews will be conducted in a number of states both within and without the Southern Region.

It is expected that the study will develop general criteria or guidelines for making appropriate choices between "state-oriented" or "institutional-oriented" approaches to new or existing federal programs based on the essential objectives of the program, considerations of academic effectiveness, and the relative merits of the sometimes seriously conflicting issues of institutional autonomy, particularly of non-public institutions and statewide coordination.

The project director is Lanier Cox of the University of Texas.

Usdan-Minar-Hurwitz Study

This study is concerned with an analysis of the conflict between higher and secondary education with a focus on 13 and 14th grades. Although the study is not being conducted by an organization, it is being supported by the American Council on Education and the Education Commission of the States. The title of the study is The Evolving Relationships Between Higher Education Interests and Public School Interests in Selected States.[7] The study will compare states on the relationships

---

[7]The selected states are California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin. These are the states that were included in James Conant's study of state policy-making in education.

of elementary-secondary and higher education across three sets of variables: policy (including distribution of fiscal resources), institutional relationships, and background characteristics. These might be seen, respectively, as dependent, intervening, and independent variables. It is expected that the study will produce a set of reasonably systematic comparative case studies.

In the study, the investigators plan to examine the relationship between the interest groups and individuals who represent the different levels of education at selected state capitols. It is believed that the proliferation of state coordinating agencies for higher education may represent in a few states a threat to existing public school interests in terms of who gets what share of the educational financial pie. In other states patterns of cooperation may already exist between the interest groups and individuals representing the various educational levels. There are states where open warfare has broken out over control of the 13 and 14 grade representatives of the two educational levels. In most states the various educational forces studiously ignore each other and pursue their financial goals quite independently. The major study goal is to analyze the current status of these relationships and attempt to project patterns which appear to be evolving throughout the country, whether these patterns reflect mutual apathy, antipathy, or consensus between the public school interests and their counterparts from higher education. The political and financial stakes are high and the future of the American educational system at all levels largely hinges upon responsible and responsive executive and legislative action at the state level. Enlightened and cooperative leadership on the part

of all educators is the sine qua non of this effort, according to the investigators.

Unlike some of the studies mentioned, this one will be concerned to a considerable extent with the political setting in which higher education finds itself. As the investigators point out, institutions and precedents of educational decision-making do not themselves stand in a vacuum, but presumably reflect whatever these characteristics of a society are that give its government features of distinction. Some of the forces that seem to shape the real world of education are: socio-economic characteristics (e.g., size, wealth, income distribution, level of urbanization, ethnicity of population, etc.), region, political characteristics (e.g., party competitiveness) and general educational characteristics (e.g., effort, level of state aid, etc.).

The participants in the study are Michael Usdan, Teachers College, Columbia University; David W. Minar, Center for Metropolitan Studies, Northwestern University; and Emanuel Hurwitz, Jr., School of Education, Northwestern University.

Knoller Study

Another related study is an analysis of State Aid to Non-Public Institutions of Higher Education. The study will include a constitutional delineation of the exact degree of state aid to private higher education. Close attention in this study will be paid to federal and state court decisions directly or indirectly affecting the relationship between state governments and their educational institutions. Another part of the study will center almost exclusively on an analysis of those state aid programs currently benefiting non-public colleges and universities. Included will

be those programs where aid is given directly to the institutions, even where such aid may appear to be contrary to constitutional restrictions and to the doctrines of separation of church and state. Also reviewed will be programs of indirect assistance such as scholarships awarded directly to students, student loan programs authorized and/or guaranteed by the state, and special building programs. Other programs that may be included are specific categorical aid to institutions, including construction project schemes, textbook purchases, teacher training programs, etc.

It is felt that an analysis of state aid programs to institutions of higher education is of limited application unless discussed together with the reasons for these programs. It is well known that today virtually all institutions of higher education are encountering significant economic problems. Ultimately, the complete absence of state aid to non-public institutions may place some of these institutions at such an economic disadvantage that the quality of higher education would be affected. Thus both the private and public sectors of the state wish to know how great is the need for state aid to non-public institutions.

For this purpose, the project will examine the many economic factors which have acted as a catalyst for the consideration, initiation, and development of state aid programs to non-public institutions of higher education. A discussion and evaluation of the present and planned future ratios of public to private institutions of higher education and their relationship to the private sector of the economy will be included. Also to be included is a survey of the economic strengths of the non-public institutions--size of institutions, enrollment,

tuition fees, endowments, etc.--and an assessment of these strengths in light of projected financial obligations.

In addition the study will include a detailed analysis of the political implications and consequences of state aid to non-public institutions of higher education. The opinions and attitudes of governmental officials, legislators, program administrators, interest group representatives, educators and economists are to be presented and analyzed to determine the effects of political and economic pressures on the structure and development of state aid programs. Questions to be raised are: Is it recognized by those involved in the decision-making process that constitutional restrictions may be undermined to satisfy political and economic pressures? What techniques have been used by the political and academic communities to strike a balance between solving the economic problems affecting non-public institutions and maintaining the "integrity of the law?" What strategies do interest groups follow in their efforts to increase or diminish the chances of passage of state aid legislation? What are the patterns of conflict over the implementation of aid programs between branches of government; between the public and private sectors of the economy; between various interest groups? How might reapportionment affect state aid programs as the balance of power is redefined within the state legislatures? How might the administration of state aid programs be affected by the complementary and competing federal aid programs? And, above all, are there any foreseeable solutions to the many perplexing problems raised by the state aid issue?

The investigator in this study is Richard A. Knoller. The study

is undertaken for a doctorate in political science at Johns Hopkins University and has been partly supported by the American Council on Education.

Individual States

Other studies underway, or just completed, look at planning and coordination in individual states. Most, but not all, of these studies are doctoral theses.

California. James G. Paltridge's California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education was published by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California, Berkeley in 1966. It is an administrative and organizational study of the coordinating council created in 1960 as a part of the California master plan. The emphasis in the study is on the changing role and procedures of the Council that have occurred since its creation.

The study was undertaken with two objectives. The first was to analyze the principal changes which have been made in the Council and to discover the reasons for these changes. "The second was to develop, from the study of the council's experiences, certain hypotheses related to cause and effect of organizational change in coordinating agencies and to present proposals for future investigations of these agencies and their place in statewide public higher education systems."

Mr. Paltridge is now looking at coordination in Wisconsin for the American Council on Education study under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education.

The other single state studies completed are: Illinois. Robert Owen Marsh is the author of Coordination of State Higher Education in

Illinois: a Case Study, a doctoral dissertation at Illinois State University, 1967. New Mexico. Harold W. Lavender is the author of The New Mexico Board of Educational Finance: A Study in the Control of Higher Education, a doctoral dissertation at the University of New Mexico, 1965. Kentucky. Charles White is the author of The Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education: Analysis of a Change in Structure, a doctoral dissertation at Ohio State University, 1967.

Washington. A study underway in Washington by Frank Brouillet will analyze that state's voluntary coordination. The study will be a doctoral dissertation. Mr. Brouillet is a member of the Washington House of Representatives and is chairman of the Interim Committee on Education.

Conclusion

This is a review, sometimes too brief, of the several studies completed or in progress on coordination and planning of higher education across the country. It is obvious that the topic is popular and this is probably all to the good. Many of the important decisions concerning a state's higher education system will be made by coordinating and planning agencies. We need to take a hard look at the implications of recent and apparent future developments. These studies will help in providing the information and analysis for the searching view.

One other point comes through from these studies--and in fact because these studies were undertaken. That is we are going to look more and more at higher education on a statewide basis, rather than looking solely at the problems of this institution or that. Through one device or another, higher education in a state will become more integrative--and in this process the non-public institution will become more a part of the statewide system.